



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,848	09/11/2003	Ruei-chin Luo	24061.78	5534

42717 7590 04/18/2007  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100  
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/659,848

Applicant(s)

LUO ET AL.

Examiner

Chuck O. Kendall

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2192

**Detailed Action**

1. This action is in response to Application filed 02/06/2007.
2. Claims 1 – 20 have been examined and are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508.

Regarding claims 1,13 and 19 Dangelo discloses a method for accessing a plurality of memory compiler units, the method comprising:

prompting, via a multi-compiler interface, for a selection of a first memory compiler unit from a plurality of memory compiler units (10:50 – 60);

remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit (18:1 – 5, see compile and link);

generating a combination datasheet comprising a plurality of memory instances (14:8 – 15, see generating data sheet).

Art Unit: 2192

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1 further comprising:

prompting, via the multi-compiler interface, for a selection of a second memory compiler unit from the plurality of memory compiler units (10:50 – 60);

remotely linking to the selected second memory compiler unit (18:1 – 5, see compile and link); and

generating the combination datasheet comprising a plurality of memory instances created by both the first and second memory compiler units (14:8 – 15, see generating data sheet).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1 wherein the prompting comprises:

requesting a user to select a link to the first memory compiler unit (Dangelo, 8:47 – 55).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2192

6. Claims 3 – 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508 as applied in claim 2 in view of Zizzo USPN 6,578,174 B2.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Dangelo discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 2 above. Dangelo doesn't expressly disclose displaying the combination datasheet on a web page. However, Zizzo in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses making available data sheets and the like regarding electronic components and which is linked to remote locations (Zizzo, 6:20 – 40, see FIG. 2, 230 for internet).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dangelo and Zizzo because, it would enable providing information of useful capabilities (Zizzo, 6:20 – 25).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1 wherein the plurality of memory compiler units are provided on separate servers Zizzo, see FIG 2, 260, 232, 234 – 244, for servers).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, the method of claim 1 further comprising providing the plurality of memory compiler units on at least two separate servers (Zizzo, FIG 2, 260, 232, 234 – 244, for servers).

Art Unit: 2192

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1 further comprising providing the multi-compiler interface and the plurality of memory compiler units on at least two separate servers (Zizzo, FIG 2, 260,232,234 – 244, for servers and all associated text).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1 wherein remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit comprises:

displaying a web page associated with the selected first memory compiler unit (Zizzo, 7:10 – 15).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, the method of claim 1 wherein remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit comprises:  
soliciting inputs to one or more parameters through a web-based screen display (Zizzo, 6:20 – 40, see FIG. 2, 230 for internet).

Regarding claim 11, method of claim 1, wherein the remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit comprises creating a footprint based on the inputs and displaying the footprint on a web page (Zizzo, 6:17 - 20 see footprint).

7. Claims 12, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508 in view of Zizzo USPN

Art Unit: 2192

6,578,174 B2 as applied in claim 1 and further in view of Watanabe et al. USPN 6,157,947.

Regarding claim 12, Dangelo as modified by Zizzo discloses all the claimed limitations as disclosed in claim 1 above. The combination of Dangelo and Zizzo doesn't expressly wherein remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit comprises storing the design files on a FTP server. However, Watanabe discloses in an analogous art and similar configuration transferring data between servers and the internet using FTP, further stating that FTP is a standard file transferring protocol (7:30 – 35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dangelo and Zizzo with Watanabe because, it would enable transferring files between servers and the internet.

Regarding claim 14, the computer readable medium of claim 12 further comprising providing a plurality of memory compiler units accessible through a multi-compiler interface (Dangelo, 10:50 – 60).

Regarding claim 18, the method of claim 12 further comprising displaying a footprint on a web page (Zizzo, 6:17 - 20 see footprint).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2192

8. Applicant's arguments filed 01/23/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument (1), Applicant argues on page 5 of his response that in claims 1, 2 and 7 that the prior art of record, Dangelo US 5,493,508 doesn't disclose, "whereby the user is prompted via a multi-compiler interface, for a selection of a first memory compiler unit from a plurality of memory compiler units".

Response (1), Specifically in claims 1 and 2, Applicants plain language of claim only calls for "prompting, via a multi-compiler interface, for a selection..." and doesn't identify a user. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., prompting a user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Hence Applicants arguments in claims 1 and 2 is moot.

Regarding claim 7, Examiner still believes this limitation is taught by Dangelo. In FIG. 8, items 806 a user interface is disclosed which facilitates user interaction see 16:35 – 43. In 10:50 – 65, Dangelo also discloses generating memory blocks using memory compilers. Applicant argues further in his third paragraph that Dangelo doesn't disclose a plurality of memory compilers, however Examiner interprets generating the memory blocks as pointed out above to include the use of more than one memory compiler.



Art Unit: 2192

Applicant also makes the same argument for claim 13, with regards to not teaching prompting by the user to select the memory compiler, please see response above for claims 1, 2 and 7 as previously addressed above.

Applicant also makes the same argument with regards to claim 19, that Dangelo only discloses a single memory compiler unit. However, as discussed above in 10:50 – 65, Dangelo discloses generating the memory block using memory compilers which Examiner interprets to include more than one memory compiler.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 10 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

“...calculating memory instance ratios based on the inputs and displaying the memory instance ratios on a web page”.

#### **Correspondence information**

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

Art Unit: 2192

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ck.

Chuck Kendall

4/16/07